UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/851,832	05/09/2001	Julian S. Taylor	SMQ-118/P6144	3937

959   7590   04/08/2005

LAHIVE & COCKFIELD, LLP.
28 STATE STREET
BOSTON, MA 02109

EXAMINER
KHATRI, ANIL

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2193	

DATE MAILED: 04/08/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
		09/851,832	TAYLOR, JULIAN S.
		Examiner	Art Unit	
		Anil Khatri	2193	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _02 November 2004_.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-54_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-54_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

Response to Amendment

This action is in response to the request for reconsideration filed on 11/2/2004.

As per applicant's request claims 1-54 have been considered but they are not persuasive.

Claims 1-54 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable over *Prinzing* USPN 6,496,202.

In remarks applicant argues,

I) "Receiving with the user interface module from the application program after reaching the processing point an interaction object specifying data and generating output data to render on the output device from the interaction object" as to claims 1, 19 and 37.

II) "An interaction object in updating a view and interaction object provided from the controller directly to view both which resides on the user interface module".

III) "No disclosure on a change to a view made because of direct communications between controller to the view".

IV) "No disclosure on transmission of an object from outside of the view to the view such as view being capable of modifying itself by using and interaction object and without use of factory or a model".

V) "Single component including both view and controller in which the controller communicates directly to the view".

VI) "No disclosure of acquiring user input adding the input into an object or transmitting the object to the model".

VII) "No disclosure of that the model sending an object to the controller for modification and

transmission back to the model".

VIII) "Including input from user in a transmission between the controller and the model".

Response to the applicant's arguments,

I) It was noted in the cited reference that GUI have been used in order to send and receive the

command and to view the model as depicted in figures 4, 5 and 8 and in abstract. Reference

fairly suggests receiving with the user interface module from the application program after

reaching the processing point and interaction of objects with specifying data (see column 5, lines

19-27, column 18, lines 42-44). Thus limitations are met by the reference.

II) It was also noted in the reference that updating a view and interaction object provided from

the controller directly to view both which resides on the user interface module as depicted in

figure 4, column 4, lines 30-35. Therefore, examiner believes that reference fairly suggests that

viewing has been facilitated with controller. Thus limitations are met by the reference.

III) Cited reference fairly suggests that the change to a view made because of direct

communications between controller to the view has been done by customizing GUI that

represents the view in a model, view and with controller architecture see figures 4, 5 and 8. Thus

limitations are met by the reference.

IV) It was also noted in the reference and as well with the applicant on remarks' page 14 3rd

paragraph line 2 that controller does send a change request to the mode and that transmissions on

objects from outside has been done and the view to the view such as view being capable of

modifying itself by using and interaction object and without use of factory or a model has been

introduced (see column 4, lines 25-35), therefore, reference has fairly suggested that there is

some sort of communication even though model or view has not changed. Therefore, limitations

are met by the references.

V) It was also noted that including both view and controller in which the controller

communicates directly to the view have been fairly suggested by the reference on column 6, lines

44-55. Thus limitations are met by the reference.

VI) It was fairly suggested in the reference that acquiring user input adding the input into an

object or transmitting the object to the model as depicted in figure 4 which allows acquiring

input and thru controller changes have been mode into the model. Thus limitations are met by the

reference.

VII) It was noted that reference also discloses that model sending an object to the controller for

modification and transmission back to the model and figures 5 AB depicts see column 6, lines

49-55. Thus limitations are met by the reference.

VIII) Figures 5 and 8 depicts that there is a transmission between the controller and the model.

Thus limitations are met by the reference.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,
however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing
date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the
examiner should be directed to Anil Khatri, Primary Examiner whose telephone number is 571-
272-3725. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's
supervisor, Kakali Chaki can be reached on 571-272-3719. The fax phone number for the
organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent
Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications
may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished
applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR
system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR
system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

***

ANIL KHATRI
PRIMARY EXAMINER